

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 through 19 and 23 through 43 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 32 are amended, and claim 22 has been canceled by this amendment without prejudice. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable.

Claim 4 stands objected to for a minor grammatical informality. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 has been revised commensurate with the suggestion outlined in the Action.

Claims 1 through 12, 15 through 17, 23 through 33, 35, 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 98/44185 to Rogers et al. (hereinafter "Rogers").

The Rogers patent is directed to an article for treating fabrics having an absorbent carrier substrate and a liquid cleaning/refreshment composition releasably absorbed in the substrate. The substrate is wholly or partly covered by a fibrous coversheet. The article is useful in an in-home process, which is conducted in a clothes dryer.

Claim 1 recites a cleaning wipe having a composition, the composition comprising at least one surfactant system; at least one preservative system; at least one soil resist selected from the group consisting of fluoroaliphatic oligomer or polymer, fluorinated acrylate copolymer, anionic fluorosurfactant, and any combinations thereof; and a carrier. The soil resist is present in an amount about 0.01 wt.% to about 4 wt.% of the total weight of the composition. The cleaning composition is adjusted to a pH about 7.5 to about 10.5, and the wipe has a loading level ratio about 1:1 to about 10:1 based on a total weight of the cleaning composition to a total weight of the wipe. The wipe is for cleaning carpet and fabric.

Claim 32 recites a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition comprising about 0.001 wt.% to about 2 wt.% preservative system; about 0.1 wt.% to about 20 wt.% surfactant system; about 1 wt.% to about 20 wt.% alcohol; about 0.01 wt.% to about 4 wt.% soil resist selected from the group consisting of fluoroaliphatic oligomer or polymer, fluorinated acrylate copolymer, anionic fluorosurfactant, and any combinations thereof; and q.s. aqueous carrier. The carpet and fabric cleaning wipe has a loading level ratio about 1:1 to about 10:1, based on a total weight of the cleaning composition to a total weight of said carpet and fabric cleaning wipe.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rogers fails to disclose or suggest a cleaning wipe for cleaning carpet and fabric, let alone one with a cleaning composition having at least one soil resist from the group selected from fluoroaliphatic oligomer or polymer, fluorinated acrylate copolymer, anionic fluorosurfactants, and any combinations thereof, as required by claims 1 and 32.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 32 are patentably distinguishable over Rogers. Furthermore, claims 2 through 12, 15 through 17, 23 through 33, 35, 42 and 43, which depend directly from claim 1, are patentably distinguishable for at least the reasons discussed above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 4, 8 through 12, 18, 19, 23 through 25, 27, 30 through 33, 35 and 39 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deleo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,340,663) (hereinafter "Deleo").

Claims 5 through 7, 13, 14, 17, 26, 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Deleo as applied to the above claims.

Deleo is directed to an improved cleaning wipe which requires no scrubbing, buffing, polished or rinsing, with a wipe which comprises at least one layer of absorbent/adsorbent material, a liquid cleaner which comprises a low residue

surfactant, a hydrophilic polymer, and a remainder water. Claims 1 and 32 are summarized above.

Applicants respectfully submit that Deleo fails to disclose or suggest a cleaning wipe for cleaning carpet and fabric, let alone one with a cleaning composition having at least one soil resist from the group selected from fluoroaliphatic oligomer or polymer, fluorinated acrylate copolymer, anionic fluorosurfactants, and any combinations thereof, as required by claims 1 and 32.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 32, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Deleo. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) and §103(a) rejections of these claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 14, 17 through 19, 22 through 27, 30 through 41 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/30956 (hereinafter "'956 application").

The '956 application is directed to a dispensing system for wet wipes for use in wiping surfaces in the home and in industry, in addition to their use on the human body, such as for baby wipes, make-up removal and other skin care applications.

Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, as required by claims 1 and 32. As set forth above, both claims require a composition with a soil resist selected from the recited Markush group in an amount about 0.01 wt.% to about 4 wt.% of the total weight of the composition.

Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe, let alone one having a cleaning composition with a soil resist selected from a claimed components in an amount about 0.01 wt.% to

about 4 wt.%, based on the total weight of the composition, as required by claims 1 and 32.

Applicants respectfully maintain that the '956 application does not disclose or suggest any wipe with a composition having a soil resist, as required by claims 1 and 32. While the '956 application does disclose an optional substrate treatment with fluorinated materials like fluoropolymers (page 13, lines 8-10), the '956 application clearly fails to disclose or suggest a wipe with a soil resist selected from the claimed components in the claimed amount, as recited in claims 1 and 32.

The fluorinated materials in the '956 application are employed to treat the substrate to adapt the separation force between wipes (page 12, line 27). As discussed above, a soil resist is a material that treats the surface to be cleaned to retard resoiling of that surface. The fluoropolymers of the '956 application are treatments for the substrate itself and there is no disclosure or suggestion in the '956 application that the fluoropolymers are used or could be used to treat the surface being cleaned, i.e. a carpet or fabric, as in the present invention. To the contrary, the '956 application is silent as to the use of a soil resist and fails to even contemplate the problem of resoiling on a carpet or fabric.

Further, even if one were to incorrectly assume that the fluoropolymer of the '956 application was a soil resist, the '956 application still falls short of disclosing or suggesting the claimed soil resist and clearly fails to disclose or suggest use of the soil resist in the amount required in the claimed invention. Moreover, as demonstrated by the data set forth in the present specification, the claimed compositions with the claimed soil resist in the claimed amount are extremely effective carpet and fabric cleaning compositions compared to prior art compositions.


Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 32, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over the '956 application for

at least the reasons discussed above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application are patentably distinguishable over the cited references taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and the passage of the application to allowance.

March 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles N.J. Ruggiero", written over a horizontal line.

Charles N.J. Ruggiero

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 28,468

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

Stamford CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401